U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2017

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 1:02 p.m., Catherine Lhamon, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner*

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner*

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

* Present via telephone

STAFF PRESENT:

LATRICE FOSHEE

ALFREDA GREENE

SARALE SEWELL

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER

MICHELE YORKMAN-RAMEY

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART

JASON LAGRIA

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

ALISON SOMIN

IRENA VIDULOVIC

A G E N D A

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA 5
II.	BUSINESS MEETING
	Discussion on the Statement of Immigration Detention Center
	Discussion and Vote on the Statement of Sentencing Reform Legislation
	Discussion and Vote on the Nomination of Shaakirrah Sanders as Chair of the Idaho Advisory Committee
	Discussion and Vote on the Nomination of Alexes Harris as Chair for the Washington Advisory Committee
	Staff Director's Report 34
III.	ADJOURN MEETING

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(1:02 p.m.)
3	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm going to call us to
4	order. This meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil
5	Rights comes to order at 1:02 p.m. on November 13,
6	2017. The meeting takes place at the Commission's
7	headquarters located at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue,
8	Northwest, Washington, D.C.
9	I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon.
10	Commissioners who are present at this meeting in
11	addition to me are Commissioner Heriot, Commissioner
12	Kladney, and Commissioner Narasaki. On the phone, if
13	you could confirm you are on the line after I say your
14	name. I believe we have Commissioner Yaki.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Commissioner
17	Adegbile.
18	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Present.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Commissioner
20	Kirsanow.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. A quorum of the
23	commissioners is present. I see the court reporter
24	is present. Is the staff director present?
25	STAFE DIRECTOR MORALES. I am

1	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. The meeting will
3	now come to order. Is there a motion to approve the
4	agenda for the business meeting?
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So moved.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks. Is there a second?
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there any
9	amendments to the agenda?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair, I
11	would like to move to take the discussion and vote on
12	nomination of Curtis Reed, Jr. as Chair of the Vermont
13	Advisory Committee, take that off this month's agenda
14	and with the suggestion it will be on next month's
15	agenda.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Is there a
17	second?
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'll second.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. Any other
20	amendments? Commissioner Narasaki?
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you, Madam
22	Chair. I would like to amend the agenda for the
23	Commission to consider a statement expressing concern
24	about labor practices at private immigration
25	detention centers.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Any other
4	amendments?
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, I'd
6	like to amend the agenda to consider, for the
7	Commission to consider a statement that supports the
8	sentencing reform legislation currently pending in
9	the Congress.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do I have a
11	second?
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Great. Are there any other
14	amendments? Hearing none, let's vote to approve the
15	agenda, as amended. All those in favor, say aye.
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	II. BUSINESS MEETING
18	DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT OF IMMIGRATION DETENTION
19	CENTERS
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Any opposed? Any
21	abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Okay.
22	So, first, we will discuss and vote on the two new
23	amended agenda items that are proposed statements.
24	We'll begin with the statement on immigration
25	detention centers introduced by Commissioner

1 Narasaki. Commissioner Narasaki, would you mind 2 know what's under reading the statement so we 3 consideration? 4 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. Thank vou, 5 Madam Chair. The title is "U.S. Commission on Civil 6 Rights Concerned with Abusive Labor Practices at 7 Private Immigration Detention Centers." 8 Commission on Civil Rights calls on the Department of 9 Homeland Security and Congress to end abusive labor immigration 10 corporate for-profit practices at 11 Private detention detention centers. center 12 providers currently are required to pay only a minimum 13 of \$1.00 per day to detainees who participate in a 14 so-called voluntary work program. These corporations 15 have a financial incentive to coerce detainees to 16 perform necessary labor, generating higher profits 17 for corporations who avoid paying significantly more 18 for regular workers. 19 The Commission calls for heightened 20 oversight and transparency of the program and fair 21 compensation for detainees to mitigate the growing 22 risk of abuse. More detainees are set to enter the 23 detention center. U.S. Immigration and Customs 24 Service recently published notices seeking 25 information on new privately-run detention facilities

1 that would house approximately 4,000 detainees. 2 ICE's voluntary work programs are 3 provide immigration intended to detainees with 4 opportunities to work and earn money. ICE's standards 5 set detainee compensation to at least \$1.00 per day. The program is based on a 1950 law that allows the 6 7 U.S. government to pay non-citizens detained under 8 immigration laws for work performed. 9 Congress originally set the compensated 10 rate to \$1.00 per day minimum after modeling the law 11 the Geneva Convention's after requirement 12 prisoners of war be paid a fair working rate of pay. 13 For almost 70 years, the compensation has not been 14 increased. 15 Private detention center providers are 16 relying on detainees to perform work required to 17 maintain and operate detention centers such as general 18 cleaning, including scrubbing bathrooms, toilets, 19 showers, and windows; washing laundry; preparing and 20 serving meals; and maintenance, operational barber 21 and library services. 22 Private detention centers have a 23 financial incentive to exploit detainee labor. 24 deposition, one provider testified that, if there were 25 no voluntary workers, the provider would have to hire

1 additional workers who would have to be paid an hourly 2 wage to comply with its contract with ICE. A report 3 found the provider would have spent over \$125,000 in 4 a one-month period on wages and benefits but, instead, 5 spent \$1,680 for the use of detainee labor. 6 incentives appear to lead to detainee abuse. 7 Detainees at numerous facilities have 8 alleged being forced to work under threat of solitary 9 confinement and restraint. In one case, a detainee 10 was allegedly punished for complaining about unsafe 11 work conditions. 12 In February of 2017, a Colorado Federal 13 District Court judge certified a first-of-its-kind 14 action lawsuit against provider class one 15 violations of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act 16 and unjust enrichment. Similarly, in September 2017, 17 the State of Washington sued a provider for violating 18 state minimum wage laws and unjust enrichment and 19 alleged the provider sometimes paid detainees with 20 candy and snacks instead of money. 21 In our 2015 statutory enforcement report 22 "With Liberty and Justice for All: The State of Civil 23 Rights at Immigration Detention Facilities," 24 Commission investigated immigration detention 25 centers, including those operated by private forprofit companies that have contracts with the federal The Commission found numerous detention government. failed to comply with a performance-based national detention standards, laws, and court orders meant to protect the constitutional and civil rights of detainees. Moreover, private detention centers do not have the same level of transparency as governmentprivate detention run centers. nor do centers necessarily dot the same standards as federally-run ones.

For decades, the Commission and its state advisory committees have investigated and reported on the often negative civil rights implications of our immigration policies. nation's laws and The Commission strongly urges Congress to hold a hearing to investigate labor practices at private detention centers, pass legislation requiring all detention centers to pay a fair wage for detainees, and conduct greater oversight to protect the rights of working Furthermore, DHS Office of Inspector detainees. General should investigate alleged abusive labor practices at private detention centers and ICE should immediately revise its 2011 PBNDS to require a fair wage for detainees participating in a work program to eliminate the incentive for labor abuses. Chair

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Catherine E. Lhamon stated, "DHS and Congress must
2	act swiftly to correct these documented abuses in
3	detention centers and ensure that private facilities
4	are held to the same standard of accountability as
5	government facilities."
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do we have a
7	motion to approve the statement to open the floor for
8	discussion?
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: A second? I'll second it.
11	Is there any discussion on the statement?
12	Commissioner Heriot?
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. I intend to
14	vote no on this statement. I have a number of
15	objections to it, but, rather than go through all of
16	them, I will just talk about one or two here. First,
17	I just wanted to footnote the fact that Commissioner
18	Narasaki's very fine reading omitted the footnotes
19	just for the purpose of the transcript, so they know
20	that. [Brief inaudible conversation.] Yes, I just
21	wanted the record to reflect that.
22	As I said, I have a number of objections,
23	but one of them is why does it focus just on for-
24	profit immigration detention centers? For example,
25	in the footnotes, we cite Guevara v. I.N.S., a

1 decision of the Fifth Circuit that actually dealt not 2 with a private prison but with a federally-run 3 immigration detention center. In particular, it dealt 4 with Port Isabel, the one that this Commission visited 5 just a couple of years ago. I think all the issues are the same regardless of whether or not we are 6 7 private prisons talking about or federally-run 8 prisons. 9 In our report two years ago on immigration 10 detention facilities, in my statement I talked at 11 length about what seems to me to be a Commission 12 obsession with private prisons, that there is no 13 evidence that private prisons are less well run or 14 any differently run on this issue than federally-run 15 prisons. Now, that doesn't mean that Commissioner 16 Narasaki's argument is wrong. It could be applied to 17 federally-run prisons, as well. 18 But the problem is the way this is worded, 19 it opens us up to the criticism that we are carrying 20 prison unions, water for the guard which is 21 frequently, you know, a cited criticism. 22 fact, I cited it in our report on immigration 23 detention facilities last year. 24 As I said, Guevara v. I.N.S. is about a

We

talk about

federally-run prison.

25

for

here,

example, private detention centers have huge financial incentive to exploit detainee labor. Yes, but so do federally-run prisons. The notion that only privately-run prisons are interested in the bottom line I think is just plain wrong. And, in fact, when we talked, I think, at length in our report on immigration detention centers two years ago, we tried to make the argument, the Commission tried to make the argument over my dissent, that food service was worse at privately-run prisons when, in fact, the evidence went the other way. And I will refer that members of the Commission to my statement in that report.

As for, vou know, whether the argument should be made in the context of both private and federally-run prisons, what I can say is that we definitely want to provide an opportunity for detainees to be able to earn some money while they're in detention centers. That's a good thing. It may well be that a dollar a day is not a great amount for But that means we should be aiming this at Congress and not phrasing it as if it's a criticism of privately-run detention centers. Had we said that a dollar a day might be too low, that might be too low, you know, that's something we can certainly

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 discuss. It sounds low to me. But, yes, it sounds 2 However, that's not what's been quite low to me. 3 drafted here, and I don't think I can sign this the 4 way it is. 5 Thank you. Commissioner CHAIR LHAMON: 6 Narasaki? 7 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: appreciate Ι 8 Commissioner Heriot's comments and if she would join 9 this and work with me to expand it to cover the 10 publicly run, I'd be happy to do that. I felt that I 11 was trying to narrow the focus because that's where 12 the current cases, the challenges, are, so it seems 13 like -- and I actually disagree. I think that for-14 profit entities, because they're trying to maximize 15 profits, as opposed to federally-run facilities, have 16 a little bit more incentive. 17 Also, because there is a question as to 18 whether they are subject to FOIA laws and are 19 transparent, required to be as transparent as federal-20 run detention centers, I feel that there is just a 21 lot more room for coercion. So that's actually part 22 of my concern. It's both the ridiculously-low 23 compensation, because I agree with Commissioner 24 Heriot, it is good for the detainees to be given an 25 opportunity to occupy their time and to be able to

1 make money, but I think we agree that a dollar per 2 day or snacks is not the best way to go about it and 3 sort of smacks of indentured servitude. So if you 4 would like me to work with you on this to cover public 5 prisons, I'd be happy to delay that and rework it. I would say that the other thing is this 6 7 is aimed at Congress and the Department of Homeland 8 The request is for Congress to change the Security. 9 law and the request is for the Department of Homeland 10 Security, which it actually has the power to do 11 already to change the regulations and require 12 something higher than what they currently require. 13 And also, and I want to thank Commissioner Kladney 14 for this, it calls for the inspector general to look 15 at this issue to see how widespread it is. 16 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot? 17 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just wanted to 18 point out, as Kevin Landy, assistant director for

ICE's Office of Detention and Policy Planning, said about privately-run detention facilities, that, fact it wasn't that privately-run detention facilities have more violations of law or policy than federally-run ones. He, rather, said that problems with immigration detention facilities tend to be those that are dedicated to immigration

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	detention, as opposed to multi-purpose, part prison,
2	part jail, part immigration detention center. That's
3	where you get the problems. It's not a difference
4	between public and private, it's a difference between
5	centers population Is it 100 percent immigrants or
6	is it partly used for convicted criminals, partly used
7	for arrestees?
8	So if Commissioner Narasaki would like to
9	withdraw this draft and start from the beginning
10	again, I might well be able to sign onto it. But it
11	would be far more limited in the sense that I think
12	it's an important thing that we make the ability for
13	detainees to make some money. I think that's
14	important to preserve that.
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, I'm not
16	calling for the end of the use of private detention
17	centers. Actually, the statement does not go that
18	far. It asks for both congressional and DHS oversight
19	to investigate the extent of the problem, and, you
20	know, I'd be happy to add a sentence that they should
21	be investigating not only the privately-run centers
22	but also the federally-run centers. But if it's going
23	to be much more limited than this, then I think I will
24	not withdraw.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I have a hard time

1	predicting what it would be like. [Briefing inaudible
2	conversation.] Well, it would be more limited, yes.
3	The way this now just picks on privately-run detention
4	facilities, and, if you want to maintain the focus
5	there, then, no, I'd be against that.
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, I'd be
7	happy to expand the focus to include the non-
8	privately-run
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: What I don't want
10	is like something that says, you know, a couple of
11	pages of privately-run facilities and then say and,
12	by the way, federally-run facilities, too. It should
13	focus on both equally, and that means not making a
14	distinction. I'm with Landy that this is not where
15	the problem is. The problem's on a different axis.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: It sounds to me like
17	oh, go ahead, Commissioner Kladney.
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Why couldn't you
19	just add publicly-run prisons and privately-run
20	prisons wherever privately-run prisons appear?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, private
22	detention centers and federally-run detention centers
23	have a huge financial incentive to exploit detainee
24	labor, I don't like the word exploit but I've got no
25	problem with a sentence that says that. Sure they

have a financial incentive to use such labor, and the 1 2 detainees have a financial incentive to participate 3 in that. That's what makes a happy world where you've 4 got people on both sides of a transaction that are 5 willing to participate. COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I think one of 6 7 the issues that I try to raise is, in fact, it may 8 not be voluntary, that, in fact, there are reports 9 and people have complained that, in fact, they're 10 being coerced. 11 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Just like the 12 reports of maggot-infested food that were pretty much 13 unsubstantiated in the previous report. You know, we 14 have a lot of rumors that don't seem to pan out. You 15 know, it may well be that this is the case. I've no 16 objection to saying, you know, if this is the case, 17 it needs to stop. I have no objection to the notion 18 that, if there are enough people complaining about 19 this, it ought to be investigated. I'm happy to 20 investigate it myself, I mean, part as 21 Commission's work. That's not a -- is 22 proposal? Would you like the Commission to look into 23 that? 24 CHAIR LHAMON: While we're pausing, let's 25 see if we can hear from folks on the phone, too. Any

1	of the commissioners on the phone have discussion?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair,
3	Kirsanow here.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I have a
6	question just out of curiosity. Do we know, Karen,
7	do you know how many of these detainees participate
8	in the program or what percentage of those detainees
9	participate in this program?
10	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: No, that's why we
11	would want to have the DHS inspector general look at
12	what's going on. But the fact that you have a court
13	that actually ordered a class action, which is fairly
14	rare in these kind of circumstances, I think signals
15	that there's some serious problem.
16	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I think a class
17	action is ordered where there's a complaint on file
18	and that the action affects numerous people within
19	the system, and it doesn't say anything as to what
20	exactly is going on or not going on. It's just a
21	certifying a class.
22	COMMISSIONER Narasaki: I think you have
23	to show more than that, but that's okay.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: So, Commissioner Narasaki,
25	do you want to withdraw or do you want to proceed? I

1	note that the recommendation at the end include urging
2	Congress to pass legislation requiring all detention
3	centers to pay a fair wage for detainees. It seems
4	like the concerns go to addressing these issues, to
5	the extent they exist, at any detention center, it
6	seems like there might be value in incorporating all
7	in the conversation.
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I'm open to the
9	amendment of adding, however it's phrased, federally-
10	run centers wherever we say for-profit, as well,
11	except for where it talks about transparency because
12	it's just the case that, in fact, there's less
13	transparency.
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That's probably
15	going to run into some trouble here. You know,
16	changing it off the cuff here without having looked
17	at each sentence where it's mentioned. I'm happy to
18	re-address this in December and, you know, if it turns
19	out we'll agree on at least something.
20	[Commissioner Narasaki:] "and that's always good,
21	Gail."] It will always be, like, you know, you write
22	your statement and I do I agree with Commissioner
23	Narasaki on X, Y, and Z.
24	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I appreciate the
25	goodwill with which that has been offered, and I will

1 accept that offer.

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE STATEMENT OF SENTENCING

3 REFORM LEGISLATION

4 CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. So next 5 we'll consider the statement on sentencing reform legislation. I'll first read the statement under 6 7 consideration so we know what it is we're considering, 8 and I will follow Commissioner Narasaki's convention 9 of not reading the footnotes so that we will not be 10 here all day.

> The title of the statement is "U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Supports Sentencing Reform Legislation." The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights supports certain sentencing reduction provisions in the bipartisan Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act of 2017 recently introduced in the Senate. The bill proposes to reduce mandatory minimum sentences for non-violent particular offenses and to discretion to judges on sentencing in more cases. Ιt moves sentencing levels down in many cases so that low-level crimes are adequately but not excessively punished. It also makes retroactive sentencing reductions in crimes involving crack cocaine, which, prior to the enactment of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, were punished with extreme sentences compared

with crimes involving powder cocaine.

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 The fair administration of iustice 3 requires criminal penalties to be proportional to the offense committed and for similar crimes to be subject 4 5 punishments. to similar Ιn addition, fair administration depends on public faith in the American 6 7 justice system. This bipartisan bill takes important 8 restore the basis for that faith to 9 addressing longstanding inequity.

> The Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act contains necessary and important steps towards more punishments in equitable the federal system, advancing the fair administration of justice by better fitting punishment to crime. If enacted, it would help reduce the outsized U.S. prison population without jeopardizing public safety. It stands in contrast to the change in charging policy announced by the United States Department of Justice in May. The Department of Justice policy regarding mandatory minimum sentences will result in lengthier, harsher prison sentences and additional taxpayer costs for both actual imprisonment and post-incarceration integration unless it is changed or checked by Congress through sentencing reform.

25 In the last 30 years, the federal prison

1 population alone has nearly tripled. Currently, our 2 nation has over two million people behind bars in 3 Significantly, and federal prisons. 4 alarming trend was propelled by criminal justice 5 policies and not an increase in crime. 6 The cornerstone of these policies were 7 the harsh sentencina mandatory and minimums 8 propagated under the so-called war on drugs. 9 application of harsher penalties mandatorv and 10 minimum sentences historically falls hardest 11 communities of color. Although facially race neutral, 12 these policies have been applied in a racially 13 disparate manner, raising concerns regarding 14 legitimacy and fairness of our nation's criminal 15 justice system. 16 mandatory minimum Use of sentencing 17 contributed to high incarceration rates for African-18 American and Latino men despite comparable rates of 19 drug use across communities of all races. Devastated 20 community-wide impacts of these policies include one 21 in nine children of color having a parent in prison. 22 National and international bodies have 23 noted racially disparate treatment throughout the 24 American criminal justice system, including in the 25 application of mandatory minimum sentences. Perhaps

1 the most notable and egregious example of the racial 2 disparities can be found in the different mandatory 3 minimum sentences provided for offenses involving 4 crack versus powder cocaine. 5 A bipartisan consensus in Congress passed the Fair Sentencing Act in 2010, reducing disparities 6 7 between mandatory minimum sentences for different 8 in part "because the public had come 9 understand sentences embodying the 100 to 1 ratio as 10 reflecting unjustified race-based differences." 11 These changes should be made retroactive as the 12 Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act of 2017 proposes 13 in order to reduce excessive punishments for those 14 already sentenced. 15 decades of steep growth, 16 federal prison population dropped when prosecutors 17 were encouraged not to charge offenses with mandatory 18 minimum sentences and crime rates continued to fall. 19 Many of the nation's prosecutors have stated their 20 view increases in sentencing will lead that 21 increases in prison populations with the attendant 22 negative community effects without an increase in 23 public safety or a decrease in crime. 24 Reductions in mandatory minimums, by 25 contrast, allow for proportional and fair sentencing

1	in more cases, reducing these negative effects. Chair
2	Catherine Lhamon said, "The sentencing reduction
3	provisions in this legislation are necessary to hew
4	closer to the fair administration of justice in our
5	country and ensure that the criminal justice system
6	does not more harshly judge marginalized communities
7	without basis. I urge Congress to take swift action
8	to correct these injustices."
9	Before discussing this statement, I
10	should just note also, although I said I wouldn't read
11	the footnotes, footnote one identifies the specific
12	sections of the act that the Commission supports and
13	those are Sections 101, 102, 103, and 105 of Title I.
14	So now we can discuss the statement. Is
15	there a motion so we can open the floor for
16	discussion?
17	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I move.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: And I second. Any
19	discussion on the statement? Commissioner Heriot?
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Sorry. I'm going
21	to vote no on this one, though I'm happy that, given
22	that the bill is 168 pages long, that you did quote
23	from that footnote number one so we have on the record
24	that this is not the Commission supporting the entire
25	bill. I assume that most of us have not looked that

1 closely at the entire bill but, rather, just Sections 2 101, 102, 103, and 105.

I certainly have a lot of sympathy for
the notion that crack cocaine and powder cocaine
possession or sale should be punished in a way that
is reasonably close. The law now does that. This is
an effort to go back and retroactively apply the new
law.

And I want to point out, however, since there's a little bit of going back and forth in this draft, you know, sometimes it talks about applying laws in a racially disparate manner, sometimes it talks about racially disparate treatment, sometimes it talks about racial disparities. I'm not sure, you know, when we're talking about disparate treatment and when we're talking about disparate impact.

But it's important for, I think, people to understand that the original impetus behind the notion of punishing crack cocaine especially harshly was something that the Black Caucus and Congressman Rangel were very much in favor of. At the time, the view was that, in particular, African-American neighborhoods were being devastated by crack cocaine and, therefore, the emergency required that harsh punishments come in.

1 People have since reconsidered that, and that's fine, 2 You can reconsider something like that. vou know. 3 But the way it's drafted here, we're just going back and forth too much here, and I can't run on that. 4 5 Another thing that bothers me about the 6 way this is done is that it's in very conclusory 7 Rather than arguing the point, it just language. 8 assumes that it's right. The sentence that it moves 9 sentencing levels down in many cases so that low-level 10 crimes are adequately, but not excessively, punished. 11 Well, what's adequate is in the eye of the beholder, 12 and we haven't argued what's adequate here. We just 13 asserted that it's adequate. And if enacted, it would 14 help reduce outsized U.S. prison population without 15 jeopardizing public safety. You know, it's a trade-16 off, and to just assert that, I think, is not an 17 appropriate way to argue. 18 criticism of the Department of 19 Justice's May 2017 policy I think is inappropriate. 20 think that that policy is in keeping with what 21 prosecutors are supposed to do, and that is policy 22 gets made by Congress and prosecutors should not be 23 doing an end run around the policy that's set by 24 Congress. If Congress wants to pass this bill, then 25 they're setting a policy, and that's fine. But I

1	think the criticism of that, of the Department of
2	Justice is off-base, so I'm going to be voting no.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: To be clear, the different
4	phrasing about racially disparate manner, racially
5	disparate treatment, and racial disparities comes
6	from citation, so the time that the statement refers
7	to racially disparate treatment is, in a sense, it
8	says that national and international bodies have noted
9	racially disparate treatment throughout the American
10	criminal justice system. It's a cite
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But the problem is
12	you then go and argue from that that that's somehow
13	connected to racial disparities and suggesting to the
14	reader that this is all of a piece, and it's not.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Well, they are connected,
16	but the other language doesn't refer to racially
17	disparate treatment because that's not what's being
18	discussed in the other context. So I think that it
19	is
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's the same
21	paragraph. It's the same thought just carried on in
22	the next sentence, and the reader can't tell what's
23	going on when you do something like that.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Well, I think most readers
25	understand a cite, so the cite to racially disparate

1	treatment is to a particular set of national and
2	international bodies and then the example does not
3	use that same cite and so it uses a different term.
4	That is consistent with the term of art but I
5	appreciate that you have a set of other concerns that
6	sentence edits sounds like they won't correct. I
7	don't know if others have other statements.
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair, this
9	is Commissioner Adegbile.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile, go
11	ahead.
12	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair, I
13	think I heard, I think I heard Commissioner Heriot
14	say that the disparity had been reduced to make it
15	reasonably close. Is it the case that the current
16	disparity under federal law is 18 to 1?
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Disparity between
18	what and what?
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: So crack cocaine
20	used to be, crack cocaine penalties used to be charged
21	at a much heavier level than powder cocaine. And then
22	with the bill in 2010, they were reduced under
23	President Obama, but it's not clear to me that they're
24	reasonably close, as you said, but maybe I'm missing
25	something.

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: One of us is
2	misinformed. If you're saying that the sentences are
3	18 times higher for crack cocaine than for powder
4	cocaine after the 2010 act, one of us is misinformed.
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Okay. We can
6	clarify.
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: If I could respond
8	to a couple of points made by Commissioner Heriot. I
9	think the bill, when it speaks about adequate
10	sentencing, or when the statement speaks about
11	adequate sentences it refers to the bill itself, which
12	reduces sentences and also allows judges a little more
13	discretion in making sentences, as opposed to the
14	chart that they go by now.
15	Also, in regards to public safety, the
16	prison population plateaued, the federal prison
17	population plateaued in 2015 and, since then, crime
18	has continued to decrease. There is also a Pew study
19	on that, as well.
20	In addition, when it comes to policies of
21	DOJ and criticism of that, which I think the
22	Commissioner was criticizing herself, there's an open
23	letter from state and local prosecutors that I think
24	is cited in the statement saying that they believe
25	that the nolicy taken by the current Department of

1	Justice is incorrect. So just
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Of course. It takes
3	away some of their discretion. What a shock. What
4	I'm saying is they should not have that discretion.
5	That discretion is Congress's.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right. And
7	Congress, in this bill, is reducing sentences and
8	allowing judges more discretion in sentencing. So I
9	think the policy
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It hasn't passed
11	yet.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I know it hasn't
13	passed. That's the purpose of the statement.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So I just wanted
16	to note, if you believe Google search and the ACLU,
17	that before the change crack and powder cocaine
18	sentencing the difference was 100 to 1 and the
19	compromise was to take it to 18 to 1. So it is
20	currently 18 to 1.
21	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I would then re-
22	put my question to see if it would be 18 to 1 that
23	Commissioner was describing as reasonably close.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm trying to wrap
25	my mind around the notion of you would get 100 years

1	at some point in the past versus one year, so I'm not
2	hold on.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. [Briefing inaudible
4	conversation.] Any further commentary about this
5	statement? Okay. Unless there's further discussion,
6	I'll call the question and take a roll call vote.
7	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
20	passes. Two commissioners opposed, no commissioner
21	abstained. All others were in favor.
22	A. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
23	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE NOMINATION OF SHAAKIRRAH
24	SANDERS AS CHAIR OF THE IDAHO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
25	CHAIR LHAMON: So today's agenda gives us

1	two interim advisory committee chairs to nominate.
2	I'll begin with the Idaho Advisory Committee. I move
3	that the Commission appoint Shaakirrah Sanders as
4	chair of the Idaho Advisory Committee. If the motion
5	passes, the Commission will authorize the staff
6	director to execute the appropriate paperwork for the
7	appointment. Do I have a second for this motion?
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Second.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any discussion?
10	Okay. We'll call the question and take a roll call
11	vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
12	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Aye.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
20	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
24	passes unanimously.
25	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE NOMINATION OF ALEXES

1	HARRIS AS CHAIR OF THE WASHINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2	CHAIR LHAMON: I now move that the
3	Commission appoint Alexes Harris as chair of the
4	Washington Advisory Committee. If the motion passes,
5	the Commission will authorize the staff director to
6	execute the appropriate paperwork for the
7	appointment. Do I have a second for this motion?
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Second.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any discussion?
10	I'll call the question and take a roll call vote.
11	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
12	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
20	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
24	passes unanimously. I'll note again that these
25	interim appointments come to the Commission after we

1	stood up all 51 of our advisory committees who act as
2	our eyes and ears around the country reporting on
3	civil rights issues, and I'm deeply grateful for our
4	regional program staff for their continuing hard work
5	in keeping these committees active and productive.
6	Next, we'll hear from the staff director
7	for the monthly staff director report.
8	B. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
9	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
10	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: Thank you, Madam
11	Chair. I'll not go into any specific detail. I'm
12	always available to answer any questions the
13	commissioners may have about the report.
14	I would like to mention a couple of
15	things. One, I want to commend the hard work the
16	staff has been doing to prepare reports, hold the
17	briefings, and prepare for today's business meeting.
18	In particular, I want to acknowledge staff work that
19	they've been doing to close out the fiscal year,
20	including the finalization of our annual audit and
21	the performed accountability report that is due this
22	week.
23	Lastly, Madam Chair, I want to remind
24	commissioners to join us tomorrow at our 60th
25	anniversary commemoration event at the Library of

1	Congress from 1 until 3 p.m. We will hear from the
2	Librarian of Congress, members of Congress, and from
3	former chairs of the Commission.
4	At this time, that's all I have, Madam
5	Chair, so thank you very much.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a question.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, what time does
10	the program begin at the reception tomorrow?
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: We believe it
12	will start, we've planned for it to start at
13	approximately 1:20. There will be, the Library of
14	Congress has been kind enough to provide us with some
15	historical documents that we'll be able to begin to
16	look at 12:30. But we wanted to allow time for
17	commissioners and for, you know, the public that's
18	attending to examine the exhibits, so you can look at
19	them starting at 12:30, but the program itself will
20	start at approximately 1:20.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Just as a student of
22	history
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. So
24	CHAIR LHAMON: I will say that I
25	understand that that exhibit will be amazing and not

1	want to miss it.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And just so I know
3	because, being out here sometimes, I don't get all
4	the information about what exactly is going on. So
5	you're telling me that we can actually be there before
6	1:00 in order to see the exhibition?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: Yes, that is
8	correct.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And what time would
10	that period commence?
11	CHAIR LHAMON: At 12:30.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: When are we allowed
13	in?
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: 12:30, sir.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay, thank you.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
17	Narasaki?
18	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. I just
19	wanted to commend and thank the OCRE staff, especially
20	Maureen Rudolph, Marik Xavier-Brier, and LaShonda
21	Brenson for putting together a very excellent briefing
22	before our upcoming December briefing into the
23	intersection of racial and disability discrimination
24	and school discipline. There's not been, I think,
25	sufficient attention on students of color with

1	disabilities, and I'm very much looking forward to
2	hearing the experts and the investigation. But I
3	wanted to acknowledge staff for putting together
4	something that has enough meat but is not so heavy
5	that I could actually bring it home. Thanks.
6	III. ADJOURN MEETING
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Well, thank you
8	all. Thank you for the report. And with that, I will
9	adjourn this meeting at 1:43 p.m. Eastern Daylight
10	Time. Thank you and I hope to see you all tomorrow.
11	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
12	the record at 1:43 p.m.)